



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,114	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167414.2/40062.150USU1	3950
27488	7590	04/26/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			THAI, HANH B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2161

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/014,114

**Applicant(s)**

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Hanh B. Thai

**Art Unit**

2161

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states on page 6 "the objects cited by the examiner in Lee conform to the Component Object Model (COM) of object-oriented programming.....and cannot be called on to create a object instance." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee teaches a schema document implemented as a COM object which exposes interfaces (abstract and col.3, lines 5-40). A schema document implemented as a COM object is still a schema document. Applicant attempts to distinguish from prior art by citing differences particular to the specific implemented of Lee. However, citing these differences may point out that Lee teaches a more specific kind of schema document, but does not change that fact that Lee still teaches a schema document .

Applicant states on page 6 that "the property sheet as claimed is modified by each second schema document received ...., instantiated objects cannot be modified after being instantiated." Examiner respectfully disagrees. The COM objects may in fact be modified if they are persistent objects such as a document. Consider a COM object wrapper for a file. The file's state is actually persisted in a file. Accessor methods will allow a user to add data, remove data, and generally modify the object. This is true in a COM object wrapper for a schema document.

Applicant states that on page 6 that "the property sheet as claimed is modified by second schema documents provided by different resources,,, such as a word processor." In response, COM objects are often modified by multiple resources in particular in distributed environments. In fact, in a word processor (as suggested by an applicant), consider co-editing and change tracking scenarios, in which the state of an object must necessarily be modified by multiple resources.

Applicant states on pages 6-7 that"....installation message may end up in an object instantiated from the database's object class library, ...., they are displayable pages (conforming to a schema) ...does not anticipate receiving a property page from hardware resource." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee teaches a resource installation processor generated an object instance representative of information about the corresponding resources and the installation message corresponding to the hardware specific to be installed (abstract) and therefore reads on receiving a property page from hardware resource. Furthermore, the objects of Lee are in the context of a GUI (col.3, lines 5-40) and therefore displayable values.

Applicant states on page 8 that" Calder and Lee also do not teach or disclose property sheets that represent an object maintained by one of the multiple resources". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee teaches a resource installation processor generated an object instance representative of information about the corresponding resources and the installation message corresponding to the hardware specific to be installed (abstract) and therefore reads on an object maintained by one of the multiple resources.



UYEN LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER